IPEA
EPO
D-80298 Munich
Germany

14 July 2004

Dear Sirs

PCT/GB03/00947
Our ref: Magpie

Thank you for your Written Opinion dated 23rd June 2003. The Opinion is based on the specification as originally filed and states in essence that the invention as claimed lacks novelty in light of the art cited in the Search Report.

The Search Report cites 4 category X documents:

D1 WO 02 17075 (Symbian)

D2 Electronic Climatical Scheduler (IBM)

D3 Universal information appliance (IBM)

D4 EP 0829704 (Hitachi)

In light of the examiner's arguments and the citations, the applicant files replacement pages as follows:

Replacement pages 5 – 9 and 20 - 22 to replace the same pages as originally filed

Triplicate copies will follow with the postal copy of this fax; an additional set of pages marked to show all changes will also follow.

Claim 1 of the present application now states:

1. A method of displaying data on a wireless information device, in which data supplied from a remote data supplier is automatically displayed within an application running on the device, and changes to alert the user to new data or to represent that new data;

characterised in that ~~data from several different data suppliers is received by the device and~~ the device is programmed to present a menu list of the different data types <u>already stored on the device and potentially</u> available within a given application, such that selecting a particular data type from the menu list causes data <u>of the selected type,</u> ~~but no other supplier,~~ to be <u>automatically</u> displayed within that application.

We have deleted the matter deemed unsupported by the original specification by the examiner in the Written Opinion. The deleted matter is shown crossed out above; new text is underlined.

None of the prior art disclose the above approach. For example, **D1** does not disclose a menu list of the different data types available within a given application. In **D1**, it is presumed that an application will be populated with 'dynamic' objects (i.e. objects that can change to represent a change in status) for *all* data types that have been retrieved by the device. In fact, the whole point of the **D1** system is to put *no barriers at all* to 'dynamic' data appearing in an appropriate application; i.e. to entirely remove the need for an end-user to make any kind of manual retrieval or selection of retrieved data. The insight of the present invention is realising that in some contexts, this approach might not be correct – that users might benefit from some kind of filtering of the dynamic objects that have been downloaded to the device and that can be displayed in an application. This approach is diametrically opposite to what **D1** sets out to achieve and is clearly not a routine development of it: **D1** in fact teaches away from the present invention.

None of the other cited art discloses this approach or renders it obvious. **D2** for example is concerned solely with dynamic data of one type, namely weather information and describes no kind of filtering to select other kinds of data. **D3** describes (page 587) an 'active calendar' that: "in addition to storing the information the user inputs,... automatically uses that information to predict what additional information may be

needed. The system is able to search and retrieve information from a multitude of sources.., organise the information and bring it to the user" (penultimate sentence on left hand column). Hence **D3**, like **D1**, assumes that whatever information the device has, it should automatically display on the active calendar. Like **D1**, it teaches away from the present invention.

As noted above, in the present invention, the device has already stored various different types of dynamic data and the menu list enables "the user to 'filter' which services are currently displayed in the current application" page 12 line 14. These service are already resident on the device ("Services can be thought of as lightweight objects that reside on the device" page 16 line 10). **D4** on the other hand requires the user to specifically request the type of dynamic data to be retrieved (see Figure 8; the application window states "Please select information you want to retrieve"). This download/retrieval process can be slow; the present invention is far faster since the data is already resident on the device and the menu list simply acts to filter pre-loaded data. An end-user could therefore rapidly switch between, for example, 'personal', 'work' and 'TV guide' dynamic data in his calendar application.

D4 is therefore much more like a conventional browser type approach in which a user has to manually select the type of information to be retrieved and then wait for the retrieval process to complete. All data that is retrieved is automatically displayed. Like **D1** and **D3**, **D4** therefore teaches away from the present invention. In **D1**, the device automatically and in background retrieves (by push or pull approaches) dynamic data of various types; it allows the user to select the type of data to display in a given application and then automatically populates that application with relevant dynamic data of the selected type.

We note finally that identifying an objective technical problem, given **D1**, might be misleading: for example, if the technical problem were to be "how can one filter the types of dynamic data that are displayed in an application" that would clearly (and impermissibly) contain within it the claimed solution. As we comment above, we believe that the fairest assessment of the invention is that it is based on the insight that users might benefit from

some kind of filtering of the pre-loaded dynamic objects that are potentially displayable in an application. The closest prior art (**D1, D3** and **D4**) teaches away from this insight.

In the light of the above arguments, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Langley